US Army Corps of Engineers

DCAF Bulletin

Design Construction Analysis Feedback

No. 97-08 **Issuing Office:** CEMP-CE **Issue Date:** 9 MAY 97 **Exp. Date:** 31 DEC 99

CEMP-C

Subject: TEN MOST COMMON SAFETY DEFICIENCIES FY96-97

Applicability: Information

We published the ten most common safety deficiencies noted during our design construction evaluations last year as DCAF Bulletin 96-04. While we have noted an increased awareness of safety in general and great strides in some districts (Mobile Districts "Celebrate Safety" program has reduced their frequency rate from .92 in FY 92 to .67 in FY 96 and to .00 in the first half of FY 97) we still must be continually vigilant. Safety at the construction site is everyone's responsibility and a contract requirement, just like concrete strength. In spite of our successful past, in comparison to the construction industry as a whole, we have still experienced too many fatalities and traumatic injuries in the past year. We are therefore challenged to review our commitment to safety and to audit our management practices to assure full compliance with applicable regulations, guidance and best industry practice. The following list of safety violations is a complilation of the observations from last years design construction evaluations and was presented at a televideo Safety and Occupational Health Conference held on 7 May 1997. These violations are presented in order of frequency of observation. You should use these observations as a starting place to facilitate your self evaluation. The references in parenthesis are the applicable paragraphs in EM 385-1-1, Safety and Health Requirements Manual, dated 3 September 1996.

1. Temporary power cords laying in traffic areas subject to damage in violation of EM 385-1-1, paragraph 11.A.03.b which states "Where subject to damage due to traffic temporary power cords shall be suspended overhead or buried underground to protect them from damage". Temporary power cords that are frayed or patched (11.A.03.d) or the wrong type of cord are being used, i.e., not rated for hard or extra hard usage (11.A.03.a).

2. Scaffold's not constructed properly. They lack an access ladder (22.B.08), they have no toe boards (21.B.01 & 21.B.06), planks not secured to prevent movement (22.B.06.a), they have no intermediate rails or no side rails at all (21.B.01), tall scaffolds not secured to structure (22.B.09).

3. Inadequate protection of excavations from accidental falls, i.e., no protective fences or barricades (25.A.08.a & 25.B.01.a).

4. No fire extinguishers where required on equipment (16.A.26), at fueling points (09.B.03), where welding, (10.C.01).

5. Contractor safety plans not approved or approved when they are not complete (01.A.07) or activity hazard analysis are not provided or they do not address all hazards associated with the item of work (01.A.09). No activity hazard analysis for government employees on the project site (01.A.10).

6. Temporary power panels or power panels under renovation were not secured/covered to prevent unauthorized personnel from having access to them (11.A.01.b & NEC 110-17.a) . Switch boxes, receptacle boxes, metal cabinets are not marked to indicate maximum operating voltage (11.A.06)

7. Job site ladders are not constructed properly, are too short, are not properly tied off, etc. (21.D.01 thru 21.D.11).

8. No covering over or safety rails around opening in floor slabs (21.A.15.b & 24.A.01). Upper level floor slabs did not have safety rail around outside to protect from accidental falls (21.A.15.b & 24.A.01).

9. Personnel not wearing eye protection while performing activities, cutting tile, masonry block etc. which require safety goggles/glasses (5.B.01.c).

10. Rebar not covered to protect personnel working around or above from impalement hazards (05.A.13). Note: Unreinforced rebar caps do not meet the OSHA requirements for protection from impalement.

The existence of these and other safety hazards is indicative of poor management by the contractor of his/her accident prevention program. The focus of our actions should be on the improvement of the contractor's safety management efforts as opposed to Corps assumption of an inspection and enforcement role.

CHARLES R. SCHROER
Chief, Construction Division
Directorate of Military Programs